UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,707	06/25/2001	Rob M. Trace	207385	8816

22971 7590 02/23/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, QUANG N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2141	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 09/888,707	**Applicant(s)** TRACE ET AL.	
	Examiner Quang N. Nguyen	**Art Unit** 2141	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: *None*.
   Claim(s) objected to: *None*.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1,2,6-11,14-19 and 23-27*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *None*.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attachment.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 01/31/2006. Claims 1-2, 6-11, 14-19 and 23-27 remain for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 14-19 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coughlin et al. (US 6,810,411), hereinafter referred as Coughlin, in view of Pontoppidan et al. (US 2002/0161872), hereinafter referred as Pontoppidan.

4. As to claim 1, Coughlin teaches a method comprising:

first receiving, by a multiple interface naming proxy via a first network interface, the network resource name service request *(DNS server 120 receives a request to connect to the host 170 named as "www.site.com" from client 110)* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C3: L50-58);

first transmitting to at least one of the one or more subnets, via at least a second network interface, a name query request corresponding to the network resource name service request *(when the DNS server 120 does not have the IP address of the requested domain name, it communicates with one or more name servers such as authoritative server 140 or name servers 160, which could reside on the same or different subnets, i.e., reside on at least one of the one or more subnets, to resolve the IP address of the requested domain name)* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C4: L7-13); and

second receiving in response to the first transmitting step, by the machine via the second network interface, a name query response including a network address for the resource residing on at least one of the one or more subnets coupled to the machine via the second network interface *(in response to the request of the DNS server 120, the authoritative server 140 or one of the name servers 160 responds with a DNS packet having at least one IP address for the host 170 of the domain "www.site.com")* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C4: L53-57).

However, Coughlin does not explicitly teach the first network interface is a RAS interface and the second network interface is an interface linked to a local area network (LAN).

In a related art, Pontoppidan teaches **a remote access server (RAS) 20**, which could be installed on the same machine as gateway 22 as illustrated in Fig. 1, **connected to LAN switch 12 by network medium 16** *(i.e., connecting to LAN via a LAN interface)* **for accessing LAN 10 from a remote location** *(i.e., connecting to WAP terminal 50, i.e., a RAS client, via a RAS interface)*, wherein LAN 10 includes a network

of computer equipments such as personal computer systems, a web server, a file server, an application server, etc. *(i.e., hence a name server could be implemented here as one of the server 14)* (Pontoppidan, Fig. 1, paragraphs [0011] and [0013-0015]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coughlin and Pontoppidan to include the first network interface is a RAS interface and the second network interface is an interface linked a local area network (LAN) since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to enable a user to connect to a local/private network *(e.g., LAN, VPN, Intranets, etc.)* from a remote location via a RAS server *(and/or a gateway)* to access the resources residing on the network and/or to remotely configure, monitor and manage the network (Pontoppidan, paragraphs [0002-0003] and [0012]).

5. As to claim 2, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the DNS server 120 maintains a cache of name-to-address entries, the method further comprises the step of:

determining, in response to the first receiving step, that the cache does not contain any entry corresponding to a name identified in the name service request *(the DNS server 120 supplies the name-to-address conversion from a list of IP addresses available in a cache memory 130, if any)* (Coughlin, C3: L58-61 and C4: L7-13).

6. As to claim 6, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of accessing and establishing, by the RAS server 20 on behalf of

the RAS client *(i.e., on behalf of WAP terminal 50)*, a connection between the RAS server and the resource residing on at least one of the one or more subnets coupled to the machine via the interface linked to the LAN *(i.e., establishing a connection to various servers 14 and/or management station 18 via the LAN switch 12)* (Pontoppidan, paragraph [0018]).

7. As to claim 7, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of transmitting the network address via the RAS interface to a RAS client *(once the IP address is obtained, the DNS server 120 communicates the IP address to the client 110)* (Coughlin, C4: L53-57).

8. As to claim 8, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the network address is an Internet protocol (IP) address (Coughlin, C3: L3-8).

9. As to claim 9, Coughlin-Pontoppidan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the RAS interface and interface linked to the LAN are linked to distinct local area networks (LANs) *(inherently, the remote WAP client 50 could connect to LAN 10 via RAS server 20 from another network such as another LAN, WAN or Internet)* (Pontoppidan, Fig. 1).

10. Claims 10-11 and 14-17 are corresponding computer-readable medium claims of method claims 1-2 and 6-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 18-19 and 23-26 are corresponding network server claims of method claims 1-2 and 6-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

13. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yanagidate et al. (US 6,128,664), hereinafter referred as Yanagidate.

14. As to claim 27, Yanagidate teaches a method, comprising:

receiving a resource name from a computer connected to a first one of the subnet links *(i.e., receiving a resource name "H1" from terminal 11a on the network (a) 11)* (Yanagidate, col. 6, lines 16-21);

resolving the resource name *(i.e., the address-translating device 14 looks up the host-name/private-address lookup table 14a to retrieve the private address "10.1.1.20", then the corresponding available IP address "202.10.10.1", correlated to the designated host name "H1")* (Yanagidate, col. 6, lines 21-25);

variably rendering a corresponding network address for a resource corresponding to the resource name residing on a second of the subnet links coupled to the router via a second subnet interface *(the retrieved IP address "202.10.10.1" is notified to the terminal 11a on the network 11 via one of network interfaces corresponding to respective IP addresses allocated to network 12 such as "202.10.10.1, 202.10.10.10, 202.10.10.11, 202.10.10.12, 202.10.10.13, and 202.10.10.14")* (Yanagidate, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 29-36 and col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 6).

Response to Arguments

15. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(**A**) Prior Arts do not teach or suggest, "transmitting to at least one of plural subnets via an interface linked to a LAN, a name query request corresponding to the network resource name request".

As to point (**A**), Coughlin teaches a method and system for selecting a host for a client in a communications network, wherein the local DNS server 120 first receives a request to connect to the host 170 named as "www.site.com" from client 110, the local DNS server 120 is configured to resolve the domain name "www.site.com" (Coughlin, C3: L50-58); because of the dynamic nature of the Internet, a single name server cannot store IP addresses for all servers, hence, when the DNS server 120 does not have the IP address of the requested domain name, it communicates via a network interface with one or more name servers such as authoritative server 140 or name servers 160, which could reside on the same or different subnets to resolve the IP address of the requested domain name "www.site.com" *(i.e., transmitting to at least one of plural authoritative/name servers residing on at least one of the one or more subnets a name query request corresponding to the network resource name request)* (Coughlin, Fig. 1 and C4: L7-13).

However, Coughlin does not explicitly teach the network interface is an interface linked to a local area network (LAN).

In a related art, Pontoppidan teaches **a remote access server (RAS) 20**, which could be installed on the same machine as gateway 22 as illustrated in Fig. 1, **connected to LAN switch 12 by network medium 16** *(i.e., connecting to LAN via a LAN interface)* **for accessing LAN 10 from a remote location** *(i.e., connecting to WAP terminal 50, i.e., a RAS client, via a RAS interface)*, wherein LAN 10 includes a network of computer equipments such as personal computer systems, a web server, a file server, an application server, etc. *(i.e., hence a name server could be implemented here as one of the server 14)* (Pontoppidan, Fig. 1, paragraphs [0011] and [0013-0015]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coughlin and Pontoppidan to include the interface linked a local area network (LAN) if the at least one of one or more authoritative server 140 and name servers 160 residing on the same subnet with the local DNS server 120 since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to enable a user to connect to a local/private network *(e.g., LAN, VPN, Intranets, etc.)* to access the resources residing on the local/private network and/or to remotely configure, monitor and manage the local/private network (Pontoppidan, paragraphs [0002-0003] and [0012]).

16. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 01/31/2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER